UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,273	03/01/2004	John W. Hanrahan	MGU-0027	3977
Licata & Tyrre	7590 09/11/200 11 P. C.	EXAMINER		
66 E. Main Street			STANDLEY, STEVEN H	
Marlton, NJ 08	053		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1649	
			,	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Assistant Community	10/790,273	HANRAHAN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Steven H. Standley	1649		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Ju 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 7 and 8 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 7-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers	•			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the orange Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the orange Property of the Examiner Theorem 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Theorem 11.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/790,273

Art Unit: 1649

Detailed Action

Page 2

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

4/05/2006 has been entered.

2. Claims 7-8 are under examination.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior office action.

Objections/Rejections:Withdrawn

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph, enablement is

withdrawn due to applicant's amendment.

Objections/Rejections: Maintained/New Grounds

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 USC § 103(a) is maintained for the reasons

made of record in the office action dated 8/08/06 and 1/29/07. Applicant's arguments

have been fully considered and not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues first on

page 6 of the Remarks dated 7/30/07 that the references do not teach the unexpected

result that the biotin tag does not disrupt the misfolded state of the protein. Firstly,

Art Unit: 1649

Applicant is arguing limitations that are not in the claims. Secondly, the mutation that causes ER retention of CFTR F508 is known. It is Phenylalanine amino acid 508. The fact that a tag introduced elsewhere does not disrupt ER retention is not novel at al. The Examiner cannot find any examples, for instance, of introduction of a tag into CFTR that overcomes its ER retention. Lastly, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect to be able to put the tag pretty much anywhere in the extracellular aspect of the protein and have the invention work.

Applicant also argues that Heda et al only teach labeling only after the protein has reached the cell surface. The is true in the case of the surface measurements of protein made by Heda et al, but it is also true of applicant's invention. Applicant does not actually biotinylate the tag until the protein goes to the cell surface. Otherwise, Applicant could not distinguish between protein that was folded correctly and protein that wasn't.

Applicant also argues that Heda et al does not teach permeabilization because Heda teaches lysis with 1%SDS as apposed to lysis with triton X-100 or digitonin or saponin. This is not found persuasive because SDS like all the other 'permeabilizing agents' is a detergent. Detergents serve to disrupt the lipid bilayer surrounding cells. Thus, the purpose for use is exactly the same: to expose the intracellular milieu to probing for the protein.

Art Unit: 1649

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Standley whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3432**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on **(571) 272-0841**.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steve Standley, Ph.D.

8/31/07

CHRISTINA CHAN

***CHNOLOGY CENTER 1600